Southwest Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Southwest Middle School

2815 EDEN PKWY, Lakeland, FL 33803

http://schools.polk-fl.net/swms

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The Mission of Southwest Middle School is to provide each student with a diverse education that promotes
self-discipline, motivation, and excellence in learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We envision Southwest Middle School as a school in which there is no distinction between student performance based on socio-economic status, ethnicity, or gender. All students will become active learners using interactive communication techniques to enhance their creativity, productivity, self-confidence, and self-esteem.

Using the best practices of middle school including cooperative learning, integration of curriculum, inclusion of applied strategies into the academic curricula, and incorporating process writing across the curriculum, teachers will provide an environment where all students will self actualize as learners.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Looney, Jason	Principal	
Schodt, Robert	Assistant Principal	
Huber, Stephanie	Assistant Principal	
Freeborn, Caroline	Instructional Coach	
Hillery, Sheila	Instructional Coach	

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The SAC is given the opportunity to review, ask questions and provide feedback on the SIP. This will occur during the first SAC meeting. Stakeholders are given the opportunity to make recommendations for revisions also.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP is monitored regularly because our Plan for Improvement is our daily way of work. Whether is common planning, classroom visits, coach cycles, feedback etc... The Plan for Improvement is how we focus our way of work.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	69%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	67	73	217
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	89	99	263
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4	17
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4	11
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	91	65	88	244
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	93	56	107	256
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	232	290	252	774
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	101	127	159	387

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	6

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	67	73	217
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	89	99	263
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4	17
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4	11
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	91	65	88	244
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	93	56	107	256
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	232	290	252	774
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	101	127	159	387

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	6

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	29	36	49	35	40	50	33		
ELA Learning Gains				41			35		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				35			28		
Math Achievement*	25	40	56	29	34	36	26		
Math Learning Gains				42			22		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				50			27		
Science Achievement*	31	34	49	29	40	53	22		
Social Studies Achievement*	71	66	68	59	49	58	47		
Middle School Acceleration	48	70	73	50	46	49	42		
Graduation Rate					36	49			
College and Career Acceleration					66	70			
ELP Progress	45	31	40	40	68	76	35		

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	249
Total Components for the Federal Index	6

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	410
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	23	Yes	4	4
ELL	32	Yes	4	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	33	Yes	4	
HSP	39	Yes	1	
MUL	40	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	50			
FRL	38	Yes	3	

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	**Federal Percent of Points Index**	**Subgroup Below 41%**	**Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%**	**Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%**
SWD	26	Yes	3	3
ELL	37	Yes	3	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	31	Yes	3	1
HSP	41			
MUL	52			
PAC				
WHT	47			
FRL	38	Yes	2	

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	**ELA Ach.**	**ELA LG**	**ELA LG L25%**	**Math Ach.**	**Math LG**	**Math LG L25%**	**Sci Ach.**	**SS Ach.**	**MS Accel.**	**Grad Rate 2021-22**	**C & C Accel 2021-22**	**ELP Progress**
All Students	29			25			31	71	48			45
SWD	15			14			16	47			4	
ELL	16			14			21	66			5	45
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	20			15			18	63	47		5	
HSP	26			20			31	70	46		6	43
MUL	38			17			40	64			4	
PAC												
WHT	37			37			41	79	55		5	
FRL	25			20			26	68	42		6	46

| 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	35	41	35	29	42	50	29	59	50			40
SWD	18	29	23	16	41	45	8	27				
ELL	27	47	43	17	46	55	15	44				40
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	23	32	33	17	34	43	14	42	45			
HSP	31	38	30	26	46	57	31	63	44			39
MUL	55	60		41	50							
PAC												
WHT	45	49	44	39	40	43	43	70	54			
FRL	29	38	32	22	42	50	23	58	44			38

| 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	33	35	28	26	22	27	22	47	42			35
SWD	12	27	31	10	18	23	5	27				33
ELL	19	39	35	16	14	19	0	37				35
AMI												
ASN	50	36		50	36							
BLK	18	24	28	16	21	26	7	40	20			
HSP	34	43	31	22	21	24	19	49	39			31
MUL	36	21		34	25		33	36				
PAC												
WHT	40	38	23	35	21	33	32	50	54			
FRL	29	33	31	23	20	22	16	46	34			35

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	27%	36%	-9%	47%	-20%
08	2023 - Spring	30%	39%	-9%	47%	-17%
06	2023 - Spring	19%	35%	-16%	47%	-28%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	21%	38%	-17%	54%	-33%
07	2023 - Spring	19%	35%	-16%	48%	-29%
08	2023 - Spring	28%	42%	-14%	55%	-27%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	29%	33%	-4%	44%	-15%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	52%	37%	15%	50%	2%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	73%	37%	36%	48%	25%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	69%	65%	4%	66%	3%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Math was the component that showed the lowest performance.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

ELA was the component that showed the greatest decline.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

ELA had the biggest gap compared to the state average. Based on the feedback we received, the level of instruction was not aligned to benchmarks.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Civics showed the biggest improvement from the previous school year.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Student attendance and number of students that decrease in proficiency from 6th grade.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

Instruction aligned to benchmarks/standards. Systems for everything we do. Consistent and effective planning. Monitoring instruction and feedback. Improving management on school-wide.

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The school proficiency rate was 29%.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Increase to 35% proficiency rate.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

The area of focus will be monitored through weekly common
planning, classroom observations, and feedback. Common Assessments will be
done and data reviewed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Using data tracking and reflection should drive standards based collaborative planning to ensure that students are receiving rigorous instruction not only in English and Intensive Reading, but other content areas. We must ensure that students are grasping the standards and are able to apply their knowledge on the BEST
ELA. This will be tracked through formative and summative assessments and classroom walkthroughs.
Students will be utilizing the writing to learn method to work through complex thoughts and
rationale.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Effective use of data allows for instruction to meet the needs of students. It also allows for planning to support gaps that are identified through data.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

In the area of Language Arts, Jason Looney and our Literacy coaches will be actively involved with collaborative planning, monitoring, supporting and providing feedback.
Collaborative planning groups will occur weekly with each ELA grade level to plan.
•6th grade Tuesday 1st period (Robert Schodt and Sheila Hillary)
•7th grade Wednesday 1st period (Robert Schodt and Sheila Hillary)
•8th grade Thursday 1st period (Robert Schodt and Sheila Hillary)

•Alignment (Sheila Hillary)
•Data tracking through formative and summative assessments (Robert Schodt)

Person Responsible: Robert Schodt (robert.schodt@polk-fl.net)

By When: The process will be put in place the first week of school. We should see growth on PM 1 and continued growth on PM 2 and 3.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The school proficiency rate was 30%.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Increase to 35% proficiency rate.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

The area of focus will be monitored through weekly common
planning, classroom observations, and feedback. Common Assessments will be
done and data reviewed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jason Looney (jason.looney@polk-f.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Using data tracking and reflection should drive standards based collaborative planning to ensure that students are receiving rigorous instruction not only in English and Intensive Reading, but other content areas. We must ensure that students are grasping the standards and are able to apply their knowledge on the BEST
ELA. This will be tracked through formative and summative assessments and classroom walkthroughs.
Students will be utilizing the writing to learn method to work through complex thoughts and
rationale.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Effective use of data allows for instruction to meet the needs of students. It also allows for planning to support gaps that are identified through data.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

In the area of Language Arts, Jason Looney and our Literacy coaches will be actively involved with collaborative planning, monitoring, supporting and providing feedback.
Collaborative planning groups will occur weekly with each ELA grade level to plan.
•6th grade Tuesday 1st period (Jason Looney and Caroline Freeborn)
•7th grade Wednesday 1st period (Jason Looney and Caroline Freeborn)
•8th grade Thursday 1st period (Jason Looney and Caroline Freeborn)

•Alignment (Caroline Freeborn)
•Data tracking through formative and summative assessments (Jason Looney)

Person Responsible: Jason Looney (jason.looney@polk-f.net)

By When: The process will be put in place the first week of school. We should see growth on PM 1 and continued growth on PM 2 and 3.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Implement systems to improve school-wide management, culture/environment and campus safety.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Classrooms incidents that impact instruction will be decreased. Improve the relationships on campus so that there is a positive learning environment that supports all learners. Change the climate so that all stakeholders are safe and feel safe at all times.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Clear and Consistent system of management for the entire campus.

Clear and consistent system for classroom management with constant support.

Being highly visible by the staff and engage students with positive conversations This area of focus will be monitored through classroom visits, campus walks, discipline data, student grades and progress monitoring data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stephanie Huber (stephanie.huber@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The use of the ELLevation platform to provide adequate instructional strategies for our ELL students.

Using the Learning ARC, walk-through tool and providing timely and specific feedback.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The platform has student data included. This will help teachers have student data readily available. The platform will also be beneficial to all students because many lessons have videos that model lessons. The modeling of lessons will help all teacher but specifically help new teachers and teachers that are are in need of additional instructional support.

to teachers will improve instruction. Improved instruction aligned to standards will positively impact all sub groups.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Southwest Middle did not receive additional funding for being a TSI school. Title 1 funds are used to provide a Literacy, Math and Success coaches. Reading and Math were our two lowest performing tested areas. Title 1 funds are also used to fund additional teacher planning and professional development facilitated by instructional coaches and administration.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

NA

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

NA

Measurable Outcomes
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

NA

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

NA

Monitoring

Monitoring
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

NA

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

NA

Rationale:
Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- ◦ Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- ◦ Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

NA

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- ◦ Literacy Leadership
- ◦ Literacy Coaching
- ◦ Assessment
- ◦ Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring

NA

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The School Improvement Plan and Title 1 funds use will be communicated to our SAC committee during our second SAC meeting. We will also share this information with staff during our faculty meetings. We will also communicate with stakeholders during Open House and other parent nights.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available.
(ESSA 1116(b-g))

The process to improve relationships with parents and community stakeholders began with the introduction of the administrative team earlier this summer. We have reached out at met some of our business partners.

We will continue to work on building positive relationships at Orientation, parent nights and continued communication with our stakeholders.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

Using data tracking and reflection should drive standards based collaborative planning to ensure that students are receiving rigorous instruction in all core subjects. We must ensure that students are grasping the standards and are able to apply their knowledge on the BEST, FAST and EOC exams. This will be tracked through formative and summative assessments and classroom walkthroughs.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

NA

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

NA

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

NA

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

NA

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

NA

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

NA

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No